

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I want to express my appreciation to the fine men and women of the United States Air Force, who honored my great state and her great people by naming the 19th operational B-2 Stealth Bomber, The Spirit of Mississippi. I saw the B-2 fly—and it filled me, and all those who participated in the naming ceremony, with enormous pride.

The dedication of this magnificent aircraft took place in a moving ceremony on Saturday, May 23rd, in Jackson, Mississippi. The ceremony took on additional meaning for all those who joined me since it came at the start of the Memorial Day weekend, when we honor those who sacrificed so much for the defense of our great nation.

The ceremony included a number of great Americans. General Richard Hawley, the Commander of the Air Force's Air Combat Command, chose Mississippi as the name to grace this aircraft as she serves to deter our enemies for decades to come. Also participating in the ceremony was Mr. Kent Kresa, the Chairman, President, and Chief Executive Officer of Northrop Grumman, the company that built this technological wonder with the help of the skilled people and companies of Mississippi.

I was pleased to be joined by a number of senior political leaders from Mississippi: My esteemed colleague, Senator THAD COCHRAN, Governor Kirk Fordice, and Congressman ROGER WICKER of the 1st District.

Major General James H. Garner, the Adjutant General of the Mississippi National Guard, and Colonel Robert Barron, the Commander of the 172nd Air-lift Wing at Jackson, served as our hosts for these ceremonies.

When you stand up close to a B-2, and have the opportunity to see a B-2 fly, you realize just how magnificent this aircraft truly is—and the magnitude of the technological accomplishments that it represents. Just to put this in perspective, the B-2 aircraft has a wingspan about $\frac{3}{4}$ the length of a football field and, so they tell me, the radar signature of an insect. With refueling, it can fly anywhere on the planet to deliver 16 one-ton precision-guided bombs—even in bad weather. The B-2 offers a revolutionary combination of stealth, range, payload, and precision. It could only have been built here in America—and, I say with pride, only with the help of my fellow Mississippians.

Fielding this revolutionary aircraft took courage and dedication on the part of key leaders in the Senate, the House of Representatives, and four separate Administrations. To get where we are today, from concept to a squadron of B-2s ready to fly and fight, took almost two decades of effort. Standing here now, we can better appreciate

their vision. And we need to remember the time it took to develop the B-2 as we look to the future of America's long-range bomber force.

We in Congress believe that long-range air power will be even more important in the future than it has been in the past. The reasons are straightforward. Our forces based overseas are shrinking in size—and that trend is likely to continue. Potential adversaries are arming themselves with fast-moving conventional forces and weapons of mass destruction. Long range air power gives the President the ability to respond to aggression immediately and decisively—and that's what helps provide deterrence.

We in Congress, however, have had growing concerns about the future of the bomber force. Accordingly, we mandated last year that a distinguished and independent panel of experts—the Long Range Air Power Panel—examine current plans for the bomber force and recommend actions to the President and the Congress. That panel has completed its review and I'd like to briefly share some of its important recommendations regarding the B-2 and the future of America's long-range bomber force.

The Panel stated up front that, and I quote: "long-range air power is an increasingly important element of U.S. military capability." Over the near term, to make sure that the bomber force can meet the increasing demand for long-range air power, the Panel recommended that we need to invest in and upgrade the current force. In the case of the B-2, for example, the Panel stated that we should work on increasing the B-2's sortie rate using a combined program that improves stealth maintenance and performance. This will take some additional funding beyond what we provided in the 1998 budget, but keep in mind that doubling the B-2's sortie rate would in effect double the combat power of the force. That's a bargain.

The Panel also made an important recommendation regarding the long-term future of the bomber force. As I noted before, it took almost 20 years to field the B-2. In less than twenty years from now, the Panel stated that we should be fielding a next generation bomber—and to do so, we need to get started now to develop a plan to replace the existing force over time. I don't know what the next generation bomber will look like. Maybe it will be an upgraded B-2 or something completely different. But I do know that given the strategic importance of long-range air power, we need to get started. I look forward to seeing the Pentagon's recommendations next year about this important issue.

The enhancements suggested for the B-2 are in line with the requirements identified by my fellow participant in the Spirit of Mississippi naming ceremony, General Hawley. As we complete work on this year's defense budget, we should follow the example offered by a

brilliant former leader from Mississippi—the late Senator John Stennis—who along with other leaders in this chamber had the vision to start building the B-2. His vision is now a reality that will fly for many decades into the future. In following Senator Stennis' guidance, we need to support the continued enhancement of the revolutionary B-2 stealth bomber. And we need to encourage the Air Force to provide us with a comprehensive plan for developing a next-generation bomber to sustain the long-range air power force over the long-term. John Stennis would be very proud of our actions—and our long-term vision.

TRIBUTE TO LISA KAUFMAN, SOUTH DAKOTA WINNER OF THE NATIONAL PEACE ESSAY CONTEST

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I rise to salute Lisa Kaufman of Freeman, South Dakota—an outstanding young woman who has been honored as South Dakota's first place winner in the eleventh annual National Peace Essay Contest sponsored by the United States Institute of Peace. More than 5,000 students in the 50 states participated in this year's contest. Students wrote about the way in which war crimes and human rights violations are accounted for in various international conflicts.

Ms. Kaufman was chosen to represent South Dakota in a special program for state-level winners here in Washington this past week, where she participated in a three-day simulation of high-level discussions with the goal of finding the best way to address war crimes and human rights violations to ensure a stable peace in Cambodia. She has received a college scholarship to reward her achievement.

I also commend Ms. Vernetta Waltner, the faculty coordinator for the contest at the Freeman Academy, for her involvement and for encouraging participation in this type of program.

I am pleased that Ms. Kaufman and our next generation of leaders are helping build peace to promote freedom and justice among nations and peoples. Their commitment and dedication is a lesson to us all. The title of Ms. Kaufman's essay is "Justice Leads to Peace." She richly deserves public recognition for her accomplishment, and I am proud to ask unanimous consent that her winning essay be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE LEADS TO PEACE (By Lisa Kaufman)

It is impossible to deny the fact that there are many cruelties associated with war. In the news, we see and hear about the devastation that war causes in a country. Damage occurs to the land. Buildings and even whole cities may be destroyed by bombs. The real problem with war, though, is that it causes damage beyond just the destruction of various structures within a country. War affects

people. Individuals who live through times of war endure much pain. An ugly reality is that many violent crimes are committed against people during times of war.

So how does a society deal with those who committed atrocious human rights violations during a war? I feel that the only way to restore a stable peace is to face the challenge of punishing those guilty of war crimes. A society can't move on without dealing with the realities of its past, no matter how painful they may be. Several countries throughout the world are now facing the obstacle of dealing with war criminals as they move down the road to peace.

One country that is dealing with this issue is South Africa. Conflict over the practice of apartheid, or racial segregation, escalated into a serious situation during the last half of the 20th Century. The conflict is deeply seeded in South Africa's history. The British gained control of South Africa in 1814 and white control of the country immediately provoked uprising by the native blacks who sought independence. In 1910, Britain did grant South Africa independence, but the situation didn't change much as white English-speaking people maintained control of the government.

The government established apartheid as an official policy in 1948, and various acts were passed with the purpose of completely separating South Africa's blacks from the white minority. Inevitably, protests arose and they became more serious throughout the 1950's. Nelson Mandela led the African National Congress (ANC), a political organization that actively worked for black control. Boycotts, strikes, and rallies were used to draw attention to their plea for the end of apartheid. Tensions rose even higher when the ANC was banned by the government and Nelson Mandela was jailed.

The black movement began to escalate again during the 1970's and 1980's. Renewed demonstrations and riots plagued the country and a state of emergency was declared in 1986. Change finally began when a new president, Frederick de Klerk, took office in 1989. Nelson Mandela was released from jail and apartheid was gradually dismantled. Real progress came with elections held in 1994 in which blacks took control of the government with Nelson Mandela as the new president.

The new government faced many challenges, one of which was dealing with those guilty of human rights violations that occurred during the era of apartheid. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission was created in June 1995 to give victims a chance to voice the abuses that occurred. It also served to uncover evidence about the perpetrators of those crimes. Political amnesty was guaranteed for those who came forward voluntarily to confess. In other words, those who admitted to committing political crimes were pardoned, but those who remained silent could be prosecuted.

I feel that the creation of this commission was beneficial in several ways, but was too lenient in its dealings with war criminals. The acceptance of the commission was evident when over 10,000 victims came forward to share their personal horror stories. This reveals that there was a need among the people to talk about what happened. The way in which the commission dealt with war criminals represented a compromise, though Truth is essential, but at what cost?

There must be penalties for these crimes that were committed and I think that the offer of political amnesty was too generous. Citizens should be able to see punishment handed out to the guilty so that they can feel safe again. It would be beneficial to reward those who come forward voluntarily with a lesser sentence, but they still deserve to face punishment for their actions. Justice

must not be compromised in this way. War criminals must be held accountable.

Another recent conflict that has been plagued by discoveries of genocide and vast human rights violations is the civil war in Bosnia. The region has had a troubled past. After World War II, Yugoslavia was united as a confederation of six republics held together by the ruling Communist Party. This federation was unstable, though, because of deeply seeded ethnic divisions.

In 1990, the Communists lost control and Yugoslavia began to crumble. In June, 1991, two of the republics, Slovenia and Croatia, declared their independence. The other republics followed, with Bosnia and Herzegovina declaring their independence in March 1992. Civil war then broke out in Bosnia between the three ethnic groups living in the area: the Croats, Serbs and Bosnian Muslims. The Muslim-dominated government forces fought to maintain a multiethnic state while the Bosnian Serbs and Croats called for separate ethnic states.

A peace treaty was signed in December 1995 in which Bosnia was split into two sub-states, a Muslim-Croat federation and a Serb republic. The agreement called for the exchange of territory and this led to much violence. International peacekeeping forces and humanitarian organizations were present throughout the war and remain in the area yet today to stabilize the conflict.

Both during and after the war, reports were confirmed of torture and cruelty committed by all three ethnic groups. The Bosnian Serbs were specifically singled out, though, for their policy of "ethnic cleansing" in which over 700,000 Muslims were forced from their homes in Serb-controlled areas of Bosnia. The Serbs were also responsible for putting people in concentration camps and killing and raping many women. Mass graves hold evidence to the large number of deaths that occurred.

These human rights abuses were acknowledged with the formation of The United Nations International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia. This tribunal was set up at The Hague in 1994 with the purpose of judging serious violations of international humanitarian law. The tribunal issued indictments of various criminal suspects and then those in the international community were responsible to arrest them and turn them over to the tribunal to face punishment.

The problem with this arrangement was that many indicted war criminals were not actively sought by international peacekeepers. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was very active both during and after the war in Bosnia by stationing peacekeeping soldiers throughout the area. These NATO troops have not chosen to search out the war criminals, though. At one point 75 people had been indicted by the tribunal, while only nine had been arrested.

In July 1997, NATO started to actively track down indicted war criminals. More arrests were made, but NATO has not yet moved to arrest the higher-level criminals that have been indicted, such as Radovan Karadzic, a Serb leader who is accused of genocide, or the intent to destroy a whole ethnic group.

I believe that it is time for international peacekeepers to actively move in on arresting the high-profile suspects. It is easier to leave these suspects alone, but by delaying action, peace and reconciliation is being delayed. I agree with the tribunal's goal of bringing war criminals to face judgment, but the way that this effort is being carried out is short of effective.

These issues dealing with the prosecution of war criminals must be dealt with carefully. There are many variables to consider.

Even though public trials may be painful for survivors, I feel that it is necessary to deal with the perpetrators in public. Silence is not a solution. It is better to deal with those suspected of human rights violations than to pretend the damage never occurred. Only when these problems are dealt with can lasting peace have a chance.

Truth must be exposed. Elie Wiesel, a Holocaust survivor and Nobel Peace Prize winner, recently said, "There is no compensation for what happened. But at least a certain balance can be established that opposing fear there is hope, hope that when we remember the fear . . . our memory becomes a shield for the future." By exposing what really happened we can guard ourselves against it ever happening again.

Both South Africa and Bosnia face challenges in their future. As they work to bring war criminals to justice, painful memories resurface. They are taking steps in the right direction, though, as they confront the atrocities that took place during times of war and conflict. War criminals must be tried and held responsible for their actions. There are no valid excuses for killing. People should never have to suffer based on their ethnic origin or simply the color of their skin. When these offenses occur, the guilty must be punished so that peace and justice can thrive in the future.

PRODUCT LIABILITY REFORM ACT

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to make a few very brief comments on the Product Liability Reform Act of 1998, which the Senate will soon be considering. I will make more lengthy remarks on this bill when we return from recess and move on to this bill, but I did not want to let the bill's introduction last night pass without comment.

This bill is a good bill, and I am proud to be one of its original co-sponsors. It is the product of incredibly hard work and tremendous dedication by Senator GORTON and Senator ROCKEFELLER, and I want to congratulate—and thank—they and their staffs for what they have been able to achieve. I also want to thank the President for his willingness to work with us to come up with a bill that now has his full support.

I, frankly, would have liked a stronger bill, like the one we passed last Congress, but the President vetoed that bill. That is something that I think all those of us who support reform have to keep in mind as we move forward with this bill. Because even if it doesn't incorporate everything we wanted, this bill does offer much—together with the promise of the President's signature.

The President's promise is important not just to those of us who have long supported legal reform. It also should be important to my colleagues who have not. I hope it prompts them to take a serious look at this bill—to put aside preconceived notions they may have of product liability reform, and to take a fresh look at what we have done.

Mr. President, this bill offers meaningful—and fair—reform of our legal system to redress the system's abuses while at the same time protecting consumers' rights. And it contains the provisions of a bill Senator MCCAIN and I